

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Tredemark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE 001560223 M 02/10/94 ONO /194,530 **EXAMINER** SHERRER D3M1/0517 PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** IRNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS ORGE MASON BUILDING SHINGTON AND PRINCE STREETS 1302 O. BOX 1404 EXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This action is made final. This application has been examined . . . . . Responsive to communication filed on 30 days from the date of this letter. O\_month(s),\_ A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire \_ Fallure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION are pending in the application. ne withdrawn from consideration. are allowed. are rejected. are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings 9. \_\_\_\_ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_ are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_ examiner;  $\Box$  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed \_ 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has D been received \_\_\_ ; filed on \_ Deen filed in parent application, serial no. 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

Serial Number: 08/194,530 -2Art Unit: 1302

## Election/Restriction

- 1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: a process for the production of a wort (Claims 7 to 18) and a process for the production of a beer (Claims 19 to 28).
- 2. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims no claims are generic to the above claimed processes.
- 3. Claims 1 to 6, drawn to a hop extract and process for preparing same, will be examined with the elected invention.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

Serial Number: 08/194,530 -3-

Art Unit: 1302

4. A telephone call was made to Ronald Grudziecki on 06/09/94 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

- 5. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.
- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

## Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis Sherrer whose telephone number is (703) 308-3847.

Serial Number: 08/194,530

Art Unit: 1302

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

Curt Sherrer

May 13, 1994

DONALD E. CZAJA

-4-

GROUP 130